

Appl. No. : 09/855,321
Filed : May 14, 2001

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

Identification of Claims Discussed

All pending claims.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 5,300,186 was discussed, along with the state of the art generally.

Proposed Amendments

None.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicants argued that 5,300,186 does not anticipate the pending claims because it does not explicitly or inherently teach moving at least two times the reaction space volume of inactive gas through the reaction space in an interval between reactant pulses. Applicants also explained that because the prior art used different criteria to judge sufficiency of purging, the skilled artisan would not have modified any of the cited references to arrive at the claimed invention, but rather would have attempted to minimize purge time to improve throughput.

Results of Interview

Applicants agreed to amend the claims to clarify that the volume of inactive gas used for purging is relative to the reaction space volume and to provide evidence that the motivation in the prior art was to minimize purging and maximize throughput.